

and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2912

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2912 intended to be proposed to H. R. 1585, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2919

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2919 intended to be proposed to H. R. 1585, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2924

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2924 proposed to H.R. 1585, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2928

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2928 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1585, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2931

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr.

DURBIN) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2931 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1585, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2932

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2932 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1585, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2934

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Florida (Mr. MARTINEZ), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2934 proposed to H.R. 1585, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. COLEMAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2934 proposed to H.R. 1585, *supra*.

## AMENDMENT NO. 2944

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2944 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1585, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 2072. A bill to authorize Western States to make selections of public land within their borders in lieu of receiving 5 percent of the proceeds of the sale of public land lying within said States as provided by their respective enabling Acts; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce The Action Plan for Public Land and Education Act of 2007. This bill would restore some balance to the way education is funded in many of the western States, where a large por-

portion of public land is owned by the Government. This bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to grant a small portion of these Federal lands to the states so they can generate the much needed education revenue.

I wonder how many of my colleagues know that 10 of the 12 States with the largest pupil-per-teacher ratios are in the West? These 10 western States also have the lowest growth in per-pupil expenditures. And these ratios will only grow worse as growth in the West continues to out-pace the rest of the country. In fact, three of the fastest growing counties are in Utah.

I would like to take a moment to discuss how the west has gotten into this situation. Let us take a look at Utah's history, which began when in July of 1894, the State Enabling Act was approved. This act allowed "the People of Utah to form a Constitution and State Government, and to be admitted into the Union."

However, Section 9 of the enabling act sets forth that "five percent of the proceeds of the sales of public lands lying within said State, which shall be sold by the United States subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union . . . shall be paid to the said State, to be used as a permanent fund, the interest of which only shall be expended for the support of the common schools within said State."

The Federal Government never followed through on its promise. Our bill, the APPLE Act, S. 2072, would direct the Government to deliver on that promise.

The Government's lack of follow-through on its promise is only exacerbated by the lack of a sales tax base in the west. Sales tax revenue, as we all know is generated on private lands. On average, the Federal Government owns 52 percent of the land located in the 13 western States, while the remaining States average just 4 percent Federal land ownership. Federal ownership in Utah is about 65 percent, second only to Nevada.

The problem is that sales tax is not being collected on these Federal lands, and public education is funded largely through sales tax revenues.

Some may say that the west's education funding deficit is due to a lack of commitment or effort by the States. This is not true.

The fact is that allocations to public education, by percentage, in the West matches or exceeds the rest of the Nation. In fact, western States pay on average 11.1 percent of their personal income to State and local taxes, whereas residents of the remaining States pay 10.9 percent.

I urge my colleagues to lend their support to addressing the west's education funding shortfall by helping me to pass the Action Plan for Public Land and Education Act of 2007.

By Mr. REID:

S. 2076. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to require the President to

designate certain geographical areas as national renewable energy zones, and for other zones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2076

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Clean Renewable Energy and Economic Development Act”.

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) electricity produced from renewable resources—

(A) helps to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and other air pollutants;

(B) enhances national energy security;

(C) conserves water and finite resources; and

(D) provides substantial economic benefits, including job creation and technology development;

(2) the potential exists for a far greater percentage of electricity generation in the United States to be achieved through the use of renewable resources, as compared to the percentage of electricity generation using renewable resources in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(3) many of the best potential renewable energy resources are located in rural areas far from population centers;

(4) the lack of adequate electric transmission capacity is a primary obstacle to the development of electric generation facilities fueled by renewable energy resources;

(5) the economies of many rural areas would substantially benefit from the increased development of water-efficient electric generation facilities fueled by renewable energy resources;

(6) more efficient use of existing transmission capacity, better integration of resources, and greater investments in distributed generation and off-grid solutions may increase the availability of transmission and distribution capacity for adding renewable resources and help keep ratepayer costs low;

(7) the Federal Government has not adequately invested in or implemented an integrated approach to accelerating the development, commercialization, and deployment of renewable energy technologies and renewable electricity generation, including through enhancing distributed generation or through vehicle- and transportation-sector use; and

(8) it is in the national interest for the Federal Government to implement policies that would enhance the quantity of electric transmission capacity available to take full advantage of the renewable energy resources available to generate electricity, and to more fully integrate renewable energy into the energy policies of the United States, and to address the tremendous national security and global warming challenges of the United States.

#### SEC. 3. NATIONAL RENEWABLE ENERGY ZONES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by inserting before the section heading of section 201 (16 U.S.C. 824 et seq.) the following:

#### “Subpart A—Regulation of Electric Utility Companies”;

and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

#### “Subpart B—National Renewable Energy Zones

##### “SEC. 231. DEFINITIONS.

“In this subpart:

“(1) BIOMASS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘biomass’ means—

“(i) any lignin waste material that is segregated from other waste materials and is determined to be nonhazardous by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; and

“(ii) any solid, nonhazardous, cellulosic material that is derived from—

“(I) mill residue, precommercial thinnings, slash, brush, or nonmerchantable material;

“(II) solid wood waste materials, including a waste pallet, a crate, dunnage, manufacturing and construction wood wastes, and landscape or right-of-way tree trimmings;

“(III) agriculture waste, including an orchard tree crop, a vineyard, a grain, a legume, sugar, other crop byproducts or residues, and livestock waste nutrients; or

“(IV) a plant that is grown exclusively as a fuel for the production of electricity.

“(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘biomass’ includes animal waste that is converted to a fuel rather than directly combusted, the residue of which is converted to a biological fertilizer, oil, or activated carbon.

“(C) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ‘biomass’ does not include—

“(i) municipal solid waste;

“(ii) paper that is commonly recycled; or

“(iii) pressure-treated, chemically-treated, or painted wood waste.

“(2) COMMISSION.—The term ‘Commission’ means the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

“(3) DISTRIBUTED GENERATION.—The term ‘distributed generation’ means—

“(A) reduced electricity consumption from the electric grid because of use by a customer of renewable energy generated at a customer site; and

“(B) electricity or thermal energy production from a renewable energy resource for a customer that is not connected to an electric grid or thermal energy source pipeline.

“(4) ELECTRICITY CONSUMING AREA.—The term ‘electricity consuming area’ means the area within which electric energy would be consumed if new high-voltage electric transmission facilities were to be constructed to access renewable electricity in a national renewable energy zone.

“(5) ELECTRICITY FROM RENEWABLE ENERGY.—The term ‘electricity from renewable energy’ means—

“(A) electric energy generated from solar energy, wind, biomass, landfill gas, the ocean (including tidal, wave, current, and thermal energy), geothermal energy, or municipal solid waste; or

“(B) new hydroelectric generation capacity achieved from increased efficiency, or an addition of new capacity, at an existing hydroelectric project.

“(6) FEDERAL TRANSMITTING UTILITY.—The term ‘Federal transmitting utility’ means—

“(A) a Federal power marketing agency that owns or operates an electric transmission facility; and

“(B) the Tennessee Valley Authority.

“(7) FUEL CELL VEHICLE.—The term ‘fuel cell vehicle’ means an onroad vehicle or nonroad vehicle that uses a fuel cell (as defined in section 803 of the Spark M. Matsunaga Hydrogen Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16152)).

“(8) GRID-ENABLED VEHICLE.—The term ‘grid-enabled vehicle’ means an electric drive vehicle or fuel cell vehicle that has the abil-

ity to communicate electronically with an electric power provider or with a localized energy storage system with respect to charging and discharging an onboard energy storage device, such as a battery.

“(9) HIGH-VOLTAGE ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION FACILITY.—The term ‘high-voltage electric transmission facility’ means an electric transmission facility that—

“(A) is necessary for the transmission of electric power from a national renewable energy zone to an electricity-consuming area in interstate commerce; and

“(B) has a capacity in excess of 200 kilovolts.

“(10) INDIAN LAND.—The term ‘Indian land’ means—

“(A) any land within the limits of any Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancheria;

“(B) any land not within the limits of any Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancheria title to which was, on the date of enactment of this subpart—

“(i) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of any Indian tribe or individual; or

“(ii) held by any Indian tribe or individual subject to restriction by the United States against alienation;

“(C) any dependent Indian community; and

“(D) any land conveyed to any Alaska Native corporation under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (42 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

“(11) NETWORK UPGRADE.—The term ‘network upgrade’ means an addition, modification, or upgrade to the transmission system of a transmission provider required at or beyond the point at which the generator interconnects to the transmission system of the transmission provider to accommodate the interconnection of 1 or more generation facilities to the transmission system of the transmission provider.

“(12) RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY CONNECTION FACILITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘renewable electricity connection facility’ means an electricity generation or transmission facility that uses renewable energy sources.

“(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘renewable electricity connection facility’ includes inverters, substations, transformers, switching units, storage units and related facilities, and other electrical equipment necessary for the development, siting, transmission, storage, and interconnection of electricity generated from renewable energy sources.

“(13) RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDIT.—The term ‘renewable energy credit’ means a unique instrument representing 1 or more units of electricity generated from renewable energy that is designated by a widely-recognized certification organization approved by the Commission or the Secretary of Energy.

“(14) RENEWABLE ENERGY TRUNKLINE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘renewable energy trunkline’ means all transmission facilities and equipment within a national renewable energy zone owned, controlled, or operated by a transmission provider that is used to deliver electricity from renewable energy to the point at which the facility connects to a high-voltage transmission facility, including any modifications, additions or upgrades to the facilities and equipment, at a voltage of 115 kilovolts or more.

“(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘renewable energy trunkline’ does not include a network upgrade.

#### “SEC. 232. DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL RENEWABLE ENERGY ZONES.

“(a) DESIGNATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subpart, the President shall designate as a national renewable

energy zone each geographical area that, as determined by the President—

“(A) has the potential to generate in excess of 1 gigawatt of electricity from renewable energy, a significant portion of which could be generated in a rural area or on Federal land within the geographical area;

“(B) has an insufficient level of electric transmission capacity to achieve the potential described in subparagraph (A); and

“(C) has the capability to contain additional renewable energy electric generating facilities that would generate electricity consumed in 1 or more electricity consuming areas if there were a sufficient level of transmission capacity.

“(2) EXCLUSIONS.—The President shall not include in any national renewable energy zone designated under paragraph (1) any Federal land that (as of the date of enactment of this subpart) is designated as a wilderness study area, national park, national monument, national wildlife refuge, or area of critical environmental concern, if the Federal land is subject to protective management policies that are inconsistent with energy development.

“(b) RENEWABLE ENERGY REQUIREMENTS.—In making the designations required by subsection (a), the President shall take into account Federal and State requirements for utilities to incorporate renewable energy as part of the load of electric generating facilities.

“(c) CONSULTATION.—Before making any designation under subsection (a), the President shall consult with—

“(1) the Governors of affected States;

“(2) the public;

“(3) public and private electricity and transmission utilities and cooperatives;

“(4) public utilities commissions and regional electricity planning organizations;

“(5) Federal and State land management and energy and environmental agencies;

“(6) renewable energy companies;

“(7) local government officials;

“(8) renewable energy and energy efficiency interest groups;

“(9) Indian tribes; and

“(10) environmental protection and land, water, and wildlife conservation groups.

“(d) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not sooner than 3 years after the date of enactment of this subpart, and triennially thereafter, the Secretary of Energy and the Federal transmitting utilities, in cooperation with the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, the Director of the United States Geological Survey, the Commissioner of Reclamation, the Director of the Forest Service, the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Secretary of Defense, and after consultation with the Governors of the States, shall recommend to the President and Congress—

“(1) specific areas with the greatest potential for environmentally acceptable renewable energy resource development; and

“(2) any modifications of laws (including regulations) and resource management plans necessary to fully achieve that potential, including identifying improvements to permit application processes involving military and civilian agencies.

“(e) REVISION OF DESIGNATIONS.—Based on the recommendations received under subsection (d), the President may revise the designations made under subsection (a), as appropriate.

**“SEC. 233. ENCOURAGING CLEAN ENERGY DEVELOPMENT IN NATIONAL RENEWABLE ENERGY ZONES.**

“(a) COST RECOVERY.—The Commission shall promulgate such regulations as are necessary to ensure that a public utility transmission provider that finances a high-voltage electric transmission facility or

other renewable electricity connection facility located in 2 or more States and added in a national renewable energy zone after the date of enactment of this subpart recovers all prudently incurred costs, and a reasonable return on equity, associated with the new transmission capacity.

**“(b) ALTERNATIVE TRANSMISSION FINANCING MECHANISM.—**

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall permit a renewable energy trunkline built by a public utility transmission provider in a national renewable energy zone to be initially funded through a transmission charge imposed on all transmission customers of the transmission provider or, if the renewable energy trunkline is built in an area served by a regional transmission organization or independent system operator, all of the transmission customers of the transmission operator, if the Commission finds that—

“(A) the renewable energy resources that would use the renewable energy trunkline are remote from the grid and load centers;

“(B) the renewable energy trunkline will likely result in multiple individual renewable energy electric generation projects being developed by multiple competing developers; and

“(C) the renewable energy trunkline has at least 1 project subscribed through an executed generation interconnection agreement with the transmission provider and has tangible demonstration of additional interest.

“(2) NEW ELECTRIC GENERATION PROJECTS.—As new electric generation projects are constructed and interconnected to the renewable energy trunkline, the transmission services contract holder for the generation project shall, on a prospective basis, pay a pro rata share of the facility costs of the renewable energy trunkline, thus reducing the effect on the rates of customers of the public utility transmission provider.

**“(c) FEDERAL TRANSMITTING UTILITIES.—**

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the designation of a national renewable energy zone, a Federal transmitting utility that owns or operates 1 or more electric transmission facilities in a State with a national renewable energy zone shall identify specific additional high-voltage or other renewable electricity connection facilities required to substantially increase the generation of electricity from renewable energy in the national renewable energy zone.

“(2) LACK OF PRIVATE FUNDS.—If, by the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of this subpart, no privately-funded entity has committed to financing (through self-financing or through a third-party financing arrangement with a Federal transmitting utility) to ensure the construction and operation of a high-voltage or other renewable electricity connection facility identified pursuant to paragraph (1) by a specified date, the Federal transmitting utility responsible for the identification shall finance such a transmission facility if the Federal transmitting utility has sufficient bonding authority under paragraph (3).

**“(3) BONDING AUTHORITY.—**

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other authority to issue and sell bonds, notes, and other evidence of indebtedness, a Federal transmitting utility may issue and sell bonds, notes, and other evidence of indebtedness in an amount not to exceed, at any 1 time, an aggregate outstanding balance of \$10,000,000,000, to finance the construction of transmission facilities identified pursuant to paragraph (1) for the principal purposes of—

“(i) increasing the generation of electricity from renewable energy; and

“(ii) conveying that electricity to an electricity consuming area.

“(B) RECOVERY OF COSTS.—A Federal transmitting utility shall recover the costs of re-

newable electricity connection facilities financed pursuant to paragraph (2) from entities using the transmission facilities over a period of 50 years.

“(C) NONLIABILITY OF CERTAIN CUSTOMERS.—Individuals and entities that, as of the date of enactment of this subpart, are customers of a Federal transmitting utility shall not be liable for the costs, in the form of increased rates charged for electricity or transmission, of renewable electricity connection facilities constructed pursuant to this section, except to the extent the customers are treated in a manner similar to all other users of the renewable electricity connection facilities.

**“(d) OPERATION OF HIGH-VOLTAGE TRANSMISSION LINES USING RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES.—**

“(1) PUBLIC UTILITIES FINANCING LIMITATION.—The regulations promulgated pursuant to this section shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure that not less than 75 percent of the capacity of any high-voltage transmission lines financed pursuant to subsection (c) is used for electricity from renewable energy.

“(2) NON-PUBLIC UTILITIES ACCESS LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding section 368 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15926), the Commission shall promulgate regulations to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that not less than 75 percent of the capacity of high-voltage transmission facilities sited primarily or partially on Federal land and constructed after the date of enactment of this subpart is used for electricity from renewable energy.

**“SEC. 234. FEDERAL POWER MARKETING AGENCIES.**

“(a) PROMOTION OF RENEWABLE ENERGY AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY.—Each Federal transmitting utility shall—

“(1) identify and take steps to promote energy conservation and renewable energy electric resource development in the regions served by the Federal transmitting utility;

“(2) use the purchasing power of the Federal transmitting utility to acquire, on behalf of the Federal Government, electricity from renewable energy and renewable energy credits in sufficient quantities to meet the requirements of section 203 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15852); and

“(3) identify opportunities to promote the development of facilities generating electricity from renewable energy on Indian land.

“(b) WIND INTEGRATION PROGRAMS.—The Bonneville Power Administration and the Western Area Power Administration shall each establish a program focusing on the improvement of the integration of wind energy into the transmission grids of those Administrations through the development of transmission products, including through the use of Federal hydropower resources, that—

“(1) take into account the intermittent nature of wind electric generation; and

“(2) do not impair electric reliability.

“(c) SOLAR INTEGRATION PROGRAM.—Each of the Federal Power Administrations and the Tennessee Valley Authority shall establish a program to carry out projects focusing on the integration of solar energy, through photovoltaic concentrating solar systems and other forms and systems, into the respective transmission grids and into remote and distributed applications in the respective service territories of the Federal Power Administrations and Tennessee Valley Authority, that—

“(1) take into account the solar energy cycle;

“(2) maximize the use of Federal land for generation or energy storage, where appropriate; and

“(3) do not impair electric reliability.

“(d) GEOTHERMAL INTEGRATION PROGRAM.—The Bonneville Power Administration and the Western Area Power Administration shall establish a joint program to carry out projects focusing on the development and integration of geothermal energy resources into the respective transmission grids of the Bonneville Power Administration and the Western Area Power Administration, as well as non-grid, distributed applications in those service territories, including projects combining geothermal energy resources with biofuels production or other industrial or commercial uses requiring process heat inputs, that—

“(1) maximize the use of Federal land for the projects and activities;

“(2) displace fossil fuel baseload generation or petroleum imports; and

“(3) improve electric reliability.

“(e) RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY AND ENERGY SECURITY PROJECTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal transmitting utilities, shall, in consultation with the Commission, the Secretary, the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, and such other individuals and entities as are necessary, undertake geographically diverse projects within the respective service territories of the utilities to acquire and demonstrate grid-enabled and nongrid-enabled plug-in electric and hybrid electric vehicles and related technologies as part of their fleets of vehicles.

“(2) INCREASE IN RENEWABLE ENERGY USE.—To the maximum extent practicable, each project conducted pursuant to any of subsections (b) through (d) shall include a component to develop vehicle technology, utility systems, batteries, power electronics, or such other related devices as are able to substitute, as the main fuel source for vehicles, transportation-sector petroleum consumption with electricity from renewable energy sources.

#### “SEC. 235. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.

“Nothing in this subpart supersedes or affects any Federal environmental, public health or public land protection, or historic preservation law, including—

“(1) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

“(2) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); and

“(3) the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.).”

(b) TRANSMISSION COST ALLOCATION.—Section 206 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824e) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) TRANSMISSION COST ALLOCATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the President designates an area as a national renewable energy zone under section 232, the State utility commissions or other appropriate bodies having jurisdiction over the public utilities providing service in the national renewable energy zone or an adjacent electricity consuming area may jointly propose to the Commission a cost allocation plan for high-voltage electric transmission facilities built by a public utility transmission provider that would serve the electricity consuming area.

“(2) APPROVAL.—The Commission may approve a plan proposed under paragraph (1) if the Commission determines that—

“(A) taking into account the users of the transmission facilities, the plan will result in rates that are just and reasonable and not unduly discriminatory or preferential; and

“(B) the plan would not unduly inhibit the development of renewable energy electric generation projects.

“(3) COST ALLOCATION.—Unless a plan is approved by the Commission under paragraph (2), the Commission shall fairly allocate the

costs of new high-voltage electric transmission facilities built in the area by 1 or more public utility transmission providers (recognizing the national and regional benefits associated with increased access to electricity from renewable energy) pursuant to a rolled-in transmission charge.

“(4) FEDERAL TRANSMITTING UTILITY.—Nothing in this subsection expands, directly or indirectly, the jurisdiction of the Commission with respect to any Federal transmitting utility.”

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 3 of the Federal Power Act (42 U.S.C. 796) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(30) ELECTRIC DRIVE VEHICLE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘electric drive vehicle’ means a vehicle that uses—

“(i) an electric motor for all or part of the motive power of the vehicle; and

“(ii) off-board electricity wherever practicable.

“(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘electric drive vehicle’ includes—

“(i) a battery electric vehicle;

“(ii) a plug-in hybrid electric vehicle; and

“(iii) a plug-in hybrid fuel cell vehicle.”

(2) Subpart A of part II of the Federal Power Act (as redesignated by subsection (a)) is amended—

(A) in the heading of section 201, by striking “PART” and inserting “SUBPART”; and

(B) by striking “this Part” each place it appears and inserting “this subpart”.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. KOHL, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2077. A bill to establish a program to assure the safety of fresh produce intended for human consumption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, a year ago, there was a large-scale outbreak of food-borne illness caused by a virulent strain of *E. coli* in fresh bagged spinach. More than 200 people became ill, and three died. Since then, U.S. consumers have been bombarded with news of repeated cases of contaminated food—everything from peanut butter to seafood to pet food. Just this week, there was a recall of a Dole bagged salad product because of *E. coli* contamination.

We need to restore the public's confidence in American fresh produce and the agency that regulates it. To that end, I am introducing the Fresh Produce Safe Act of 2007. My colleague Senator KOHL has joined me in co-sponsoring this legislation, and our aim is to create, for the first time, an effective national food safety framework for all fresh produce.

Industry groups are acutely aware of the need to restore consumer confidence. For instance, the California leafy green produce industry has come up with a marketing agreement to certify the safety of its products. The Florida tomato industry has pushed the State to inspect and regulate its products. But this regional, patchwork approach is simply not adequate. We need a national program to ensure the safety of all fresh produce all across the country.

Under the Fresh Produce Safety Act, FDA would have the authority to require produce companies to follow

commonsense food safety guidelines. Those guidelines currently are only voluntary. Now, obviously, it would be a waste of resources to require the same stringent controls for, say, apples that we would require for leafy green produce. That is why the bill requires FDA to establish national standards tailored to specific types of produce and the particular risk factors arising from the way each is grown and handled. The legislation also requires stepped-up inspections of operations that grow and process fresh produce, such as spinach or lettuce.

Other key provisions of the bill include a surveillance system to identify and stop the sources of fresh produce contamination, and a research program to better understand and prevent contamination of produce. The legislation would also require FDA to write rules to ensure that imported produce has been grown and processed under the same standards that we will have in the United States.

The Fresh Produce Safety Act is timely for another reason. Eating fruits and vegetables promotes lower body weight, stronger bones, and lower risk of developing diet-related diseases such as diabetes. In recent years, major efforts and investments have encouraged people to eat these healthful foods. It can only turn people away from healthy eating to have continuous instances of *E. coli* contamination and fresh produce recalls.

The American people need to have confidence that their fruits and vegetables are produced and handled in a safe and wholesome manner. That is exactly the goal of the Fresh Produce Safety Act.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 2080. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to ensure that sewage treatment plants monitor for and report discharges of raw sewage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to protect health and safety by notifying the public when there are potentially harmful sewage overflows in our streams, rivers, and coastal waters. This legislation, the Sewage Overflow Right-to-Know Act, would amend the Clean Water Act to require that owners and operators of publicly owned treatment works monitor their systems and notify the public when there is a sewage overflow with the potential to affect public health.

The Clean Water Act is soon to celebrate its 35th anniversary, and despite great gains we are still far from achieving the goal of eliminating pollution discharges. EPA estimates that there are between 23,000 and 75,000 sanitary sewer overflows each year. Those spills dump between 3 billion and 10 billion gallons of untreated sewage into our

rivers, lakes and coastal waters annually. In addition, combined sewer overflows spill 850 billion gallons of contaminated stormwater into our waterways each year.

Increased investment in our wastewater infrastructure is sorely needed to avoid having water quality return to what it was in the 1970s. This is why I chaired a hearing of the Environment and Public Works Committee's Transportation Safety, Infrastructure Security and Water Quality Subcommittee yesterday on clean water funding, and I look forward to working to reauthorize the Clean Water State Revolving Fund this Congress.

While we work toward closing the infrastructure funding gap and reducing sewage pollution, we must also keep citizens safe by informing them when there are sewage overflows. The EPA estimates that up to 3.5 million people get sick each year from recreational contact with waters contaminated by sanitary sewer overflows alone.

Currently, citizens are often needlessly unaware of sewage overflows. Although some individual utilities do an excellent job of public notification, many do not provide any communication to the public. The Clean Water Act does not require public notification under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System for sanitary sewer overflows, and State requirements, where they exist, are extremely variable. This legislation would remedy that situation by ensuring that publicly-owned treatment works employ a monitoring system to alert the operators when there is an overflow, and relaying that information to the public when there is potential harm to the public's health. In cases where the overflow has the potential for imminent and substantial harm, public health authorities and other affected entities, such as local drinking water treatment plants, must also be notified.

This legislation also requires annual reporting to EPA or the State with a summary of all overflows and the plans in place to address the overflows. This will help provide a more comprehensive picture of sewage infrastructure problems, and increase public awareness of needed repairs and upgrades.

Clean water and public health are priorities for New Jersey. Some sewer pipes in my State date back 150 years, and overflows are becoming more common. In one event earlier this year, 150 million gallons of untreated sewage mixed with stormwater spilled into the Hackensack River. The Sewage Overflow Right to Know Act establishes public notification of health risks posed by sewage overflows to keep our residents healthy while we continue to work to reduce sewage pollution.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD immediately following my statement.

By Mrs. CLINTON (for herself,  
Mr. HATCH, and Mr. REID):

S. 2082. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a Coordinated Environmental Public Health Network, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, today, I am proud to join with my colleagues Senator HATCH and Senator REID to introduce the Coordinated Environmental Public Health Network Act.

More than 40 years ago, in her seminal work *Silent Spring*, Rachel Carson noted that "For the first time in the history of the world every human being is now subjected to contact with dangerous chemicals from the moment of conception until death."

Her words remain true today. Not only are we subjected to chemicals, but we often don't have an understanding of the impact of these chemicals upon our health and the health of our children. I believe that it is past time for us to begin making the investments in research and technology that will allow us to understand the impact of the environmental exposures we face every day.

We know that chronic diseases like asthma, heart and lung disease—the chronic diseases that result in more than \$750 billion in health care costs every year—are caused by three factors: genetics, behavior, and the environment.

Since the publication of *Silent Spring* in 1962, we have come a long way in understanding two of those three factors. Through initiatives like the Human Genome Project, we have been making incredible strides in our understanding of the science of genetics, so that we can better prevent and treat diseases. We have made strides in behavior change, with initiatives like smoking cessation campaigns resulting in a reduction of some of these behavioral threats to our health.

But we need to make more progress in our understanding of how the environment impacts our health. Far too often, these are silent health hazards that manifest themselves in unexpected cancers or other diseases. Yet we have no systematic way to collect and analyze the data that will allow us to make the linkages between environmental hazards and chronic illness clusters in various communities.

Take, for example, central Harlem, where one out of every four children has asthma. Or Fallon, Nevada—a small town with about 8,000 residents—where I attended an Environment and Public Works Committee hearing back in 2001 where we examined the high rates of leukemia among children in that community. There are examples like this from all over the country—often from minority or low-income communities that bear a disproportionate burden of environmental pollution—and we need to do more to protect the health of Americans who are daily living with environmental hazards. But if we don't have information to identify areas of high disease inci-

dence and understand what environmental pollutants exist in those neighborhoods, we cannot adequately address the risks posed to our health.

The legislation I am introducing today will help us to understand those links. In establishing a coordinated environmental public health network, we can better track chronic diseases like cancer, asthma, and autism. We can establish critical information sharing between the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Environmental Protection Agency, so that those agencies can pool the information that can help researchers and the public identify and address risks. We can increase our resources for biomonitoring, so that we can measure levels of exposure to chemicals. And we can improve our environmental public health capacity, so that we have professionals who are trained to engage in rapid response to environmental health risks across our country.

The Coordinated Environmental Public Health Tracking Network will allow us to make enormous gains in our understanding of environmental health, and give us the data necessary to make improvements for the health of our communities.

I would like to thank Senators HATCH and REID for joining me to raise awareness about these issues, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee to move this bill forward.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter of support.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be placed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 19, 2007.

Hon. HILLARY CLINTON,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS CLINTON AND HATCH: The undersigned organizations join in supporting the Coordinated Environmental Public Health Network Act of 2007. We are pleased that your bill would require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish and operate a Coordinated Environmental Public Health Network and operate and maintain National Environmental Health Rapid Response Services.

Chronic diseases cause 70 percent of deaths in the U.S. and are responsible for three-quarters of health care spending. Yet, our public health system lacks the tools it needs to gather sufficient information about these diseases. The air that we breathe and the water that we drink can jeopardize our health if contaminated with chemical, biological or other hazards. It is critical that we have the ability to track the relationship between environmental exposures and the incidence and distribution of disease.

In Fiscal Year 2002, Congress provided the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) with funding to develop the National Environmental Public Health Tracking Program to coordinate local, state, and federal health agencies' collection of critical data. CDC selected pilot programs as testing grounds for the tracking program. Unfortunately, despite important information

gleaned from the pilot programs, due to limited funding, in August 2006 CDC was able to award funding to only 16 states and one city. This important program must be expanded to all 50 states.

The Network would provide valuable information that health officials and communities could use to monitor where and when chronic diseases occur and to assess their potential links to environmental hazards. It would coordinate among existing surveillance and data collection systems. The Rapid Response Services would provide an important service by helping to develop strategies and protocols for a coordinated rapid response to higher than expected incidence of chronic conditions and potential environmental exposures.

Your bill also recognizes the value of expanding the scope and amount of biomonitoring data collected by the CDC and State laboratories. Through biomonitoring techniques, CDC can measure with great precision actual levels of chemicals in people's bodies, investigate exposures, and study the causes of diseases. Enhancing our biomonitoring capacity will help expand our knowledge of chemical exposures in people and how these chemicals affect their health.

Finally, your bill addresses another need of public health infrastructure—assuring a well-trained public health workforce—by developing centers of excellence, a scholarship program and an applied epidemiology fellowship program. Providing support and incentives to ensure the availability of a well-trained and robust environmental and public health workforce is a critical component of establishing a well-equipped, modern public health system.

It is the Federal Government that must provide the national leadership and resources to initiate the action required to protect Americans from environmental hazards. The Coordinated Environmental Public Health Network Act of 2007 is a necessary step that will help provide potentially lifesaving information and also improve our public health infrastructure. We appreciate your leadership on this important issue and look forward to working with you on this and other important public health initiatives in the future.

Sincerely,

Trust for America's Health, Action Now, Adapted Physical Activity Council, Alliance for Healthy Homes, American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, American College of Preventive Medicine, American Lung Association, American Public Health Association, Association of Public Health Laboratories, Breast Cancer Action, Breast Cancer Fund, California Safe Schools, Catholic Healthcare West, Center for Science in the Public Interest, Clean Water Action Midwest Office, Coalition for Clean Air, Commonwealth, Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists, Environmental Defense, Environmental Health Network, Families Against Cancer and Toxics, Healthy Building Network, Healthy Homes Collaborative, Healthy Schools Network—Washington, DC, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy, Institute for Children's Environmental Health, Institute of Neurotoxicology & Neurological Disorders, March of Dimes Foundation, Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy, MOMS (Making Our Milk Safe), National Association for Public Health Statistics and Information Systems, National Association of County and City Health Officials, National As-

sociation of Health Data Organization, National Disease Clusters Alliance, National Research Center for Women & Families, Olympic Environmental Council, Oregon Environmental Council, Pesticide Action Network North America, Physicians for Social Responsibility, PTAirWatchers.org, Research Institute for Independent Living, Sciencecorps, Tulane Center for Applied Environmental Public Health, Tulane School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine, Women's Voices for the Earth.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues, Senator CLINTON and Senator REID, in introducing today the Coordinated Environmental Health Network Act.

In modern society, we often take for granted the advances in public health measures made during the last century. Initiatives like drinking water protections and food safety programs have helped to counterattack infectious disease and add up to 25 years to the average human life expectancy.

Yet America today is faced by new public health challenges along with recurrence of chronic and infectious diseases. Chronic diseases account for approximately 70 percent of all deaths every year, most of which are preventable. These diseases also cause major limitations in daily living for about 25 million Americans and contribute more than \$750 million to annual health care costs.

As an example of a new health threat, the West Nile virus had never before been detected in this hemisphere before the 2000 outbreak in New York. In 2007 alone, 1,982 human cases have been reported in almost every State and the District of Columbia.

Food-borne illnesses are estimated to cause 5,000 deaths a year; and asthma, a chronic condition, is the number one reason children miss school and is also expected to affect 29 million Americans within the next decade—more than twice the current number of people with asthma.

We know that the environment plays an important role in health and human development; but we do not know to what extent. Scientific researchers have linked specific diseases and health effects to certain environmental causes—for instance, infected mosquito bites and the West Nile virus, or asbestos and lung cancer—but many other links remain unproven, such as those between aluminum and Alzheimer's disease, or exposure to disinfectant by-products and bladder cancer.

The bottom line is that, if we are going to prevent disease, researchers need more complete information about environmental factors, their effect on people, and the resulting health outcomes.

The environmental exposure, biomonitoring, and incidence of chronic and infectious diseases data that do exist are not readily accessible by all the appropriate systems. Although the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, has begun efforts in this

area through its National Environmental Public Health Tracking Program—in which my home State of Utah is a participant—currently, no network exists to track environmental health data full-scale at the national level. Furthermore, at the state and local levels, environmental quality programs and classic public health programs are almost always based in different agencies.

This disconnection among environmental health projects at local, state, and Federal levels jeopardizes our protection against environmental health threats. The threat of terrorist attacks with biological or chemical weapons has most certainly become a major public health concern; but it is important to keep in mind that weaknesses in the environmental public health infrastructure have led to large-scale vector-, water-, and food-borne outbreaks of infectious disease.

In the 1998 Institute of Medicine, IOM, Report “The Future of Public Health”, and the Pew Environmental Health Commission report “America's Environmental Health Gap: Why the Country Needs a Nationwide Health Tracking Network”, this fragmentation is clearly outlined as contributing to disjointed policy development, imbalanced service delivery and a generally weakened public health effort.

The IOM report recommended that state and local health agencies strengthen their capacities for identification, understanding and control of environmental problems as health hazards.

The Pew Commission report concluded that the environmental health gap results from the lack of basic information that could document possible links between environmental hazards and chronic disease, as well as information that our communities and health professionals need to reduce and prevent such health problems. In response to this problem, the Pew Commission proposed a nationwide health tracking network.

Thirteen top public health groups, including the American Cancer Society, American Lung Association, and American Public Health Association endorsed the Pew report. This endorsement makes clear the message that the complexity of today's environmental public health problems requires coordinated responses from multiple agencies and organizations.

The scientific community has also been asking for the ability to bridge this environmental health gap. In a 2004 Environmental Health Perspectives article, a consortium of public health researchers wrote:

The “building blocks” of knowledge provided by a nationwide environmental public health tracking network will enable scientists to answer many of the troubling questions we are asking today about what is making us sick. The result will be new prevention strategies aimed at reducing and ultimately preventing many of the chronic diseases and disabling conditions that afflict millions of Americans.

The common theme from these reports, and the message received from top public health organizations and researchers, is that there is a pressing need to establish environmental public health leadership at the Federal level.

This legislation will help provide that leadership by establishing a Coordinated Environmental Public Health Network. It will make available the infrastructure by which local, state, and Federal agencies can share environmental public health information.

This bill is designed to build upon the recommendations from the scientific and public health communities, as well as the program that the CDC has already begun to carry out.

The Coordinated Environmental Health Network will connect state systems that are tracking chronic diseases, environmental exposures, and other risk factors so that the causes of priority chronic diseases can be identified, addressed, and ultimately prevented. Public health officials, scientific researchers, and the general public will have the information they need to fight against chronic disease.

The Coordinated Environmental Health Network Act will provide states with grants to help develop the infrastructure they need in order to participate in the Nationwide Network.

In order to educate the public and provide the information needed to fight chronic disease, this bill calls for a National Environmental Health Report that will provide annual findings of the Nationwide Health Tracking Network.

This bill also aims to expand our environmental health infrastructure through the establishment and operation of regional biomonitoring labs, Environmental Health Centers of Excellence, applied epidemiology fellowships, and the John. H. Chafee Environmental Health Scholarship Program.

A survey of registered voters conducted for the Pew Environmental Health Commission indicated that most Americans say that taking a national approach to tracking environmental health should be a priority of government at all levels.

Without comprehensive environmental health tracking, policymakers and public health practitioners lack information that is critical to establishing sound environmental health priorities. In addition, the public is indirectly denied its right to know about environmental hazards, exposure levels and health outcomes in their communities—information they want and have every reason to expect.

Our country has one of the best health care systems in the world. Doctors are now successfully treating illnesses that were once considered debilitating or even terminal because we have made great investments in researching cures and finding treatments. It is time to make the same investment in preventing people from becoming sick in the first place. This bill is an important step forward in making

that investment in the health of America, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

### SENATE RESOLUTION 323—RECOGNIZING KIKKOMAN FOODS, INC., FOR ITS 50 YEARS OF OPERATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KOHL (for himself and Mr. FEINGOLD) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 323

Whereas Kikkoman Foods, Inc., is celebrating its 50th anniversary of business in the United States during the year 2007;

Whereas Kikkoman Foods established sales operations in San Francisco, California, in 1957, expanded production in Walworth, Wisconsin, in 1972, and further expanded production in Folsom, California, in 1998;

Whereas Kikkoman Foods annually ships over 30,000,000 gallons of soy sauce throughout North America;

Whereas Kikkoman Foods was one of the first Japanese companies to have a major manufacturing plant in the United States and continues to make a steadfast commitment to the economic and culinary vitality of the United States; and

Whereas Kikkoman Foods, throughout its 50-year history in the United States, has remained steadfast in its devotion to promoting international cultural exchange: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the importance of the contributions made by Kikkoman Foods, Inc., to the cultural and economic vitality of the United States; and

(2) commends Kikkoman Foods on its 50 years of marketing and operations in the United States.

### SENATE RESOLUTION 324—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF “NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE AWARENESS MONTH”

Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. LOTT, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. TESTER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SUNUNU, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 324

Whereas life insurance is an essential part of a sound financial plan;

Whereas life insurance provides financial security for families by helping surviving members meet immediate and long-term financial obligations and objectives in the event of a premature death in their family;

Whereas approximately 68,000,000 United States citizens lack the adequate level of life insurance coverage needed to ensure a secure financial future for their loved ones;

Whereas life insurance products protect against the uncertainties of life by enabling individuals and families to manage the financial risks of premature death, disability, and long-term care; and

Whereas numerous groups supporting life insurance have designated September 2007 as “National Life Insurance Awareness Month” as a means to encourage consumers to take the actions necessary to achieve financial security for their loved ones: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of “National Life Insurance Awareness Month”; and

(2) calls on the Federal Government, States, localities, schools, nonprofit organizations, businesses, and the citizens of the United States to observe the month with appropriate programs and activities.

## AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2945. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1585, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2946. Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1585, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2947. Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2011 proposed by Mr. NELSON of Nebraska (for Mr. LEVIN) to the bill H.R. 1585, supra.

SA 2948. Mr. KYL (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. COLEMAN, and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2011 proposed by Mr. NELSON of Nebraska (for Mr. LEVIN) to the bill H.R. 1585, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2949. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2011 proposed by Mr. NELSON of Nebraska (for Mr. LEVIN) to the bill H.R. 1585, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2950. Mr. MARTINEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2011 proposed by Mr. NELSON of Nebraska (for Mr. LEVIN) to the bill H.R. 1585, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2951. Mrs. DOLE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2011 proposed by Mr. NELSON of Nebraska (for Mr. LEVIN) to the bill H.R. 1585, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2952. Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. CHAMBLISS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2011 proposed by Mr. NELSON of Nebraska (for Mr. LEVIN) to the bill H.R. 1585, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2953. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2011 proposed by Mr. NELSON of Nebraska (for Mr. LEVIN) to the bill H.R. 1585, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2954. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1585, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2955. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1585, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2956. Mr. SMITH (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1585, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2957. Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. INOUE, Mr. SMITH, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. LOTT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1585, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2958. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2919 submitted by Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. LUGAR, and Mr. HATCH)